

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

DEREK KO
Law Clerk

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5056
FAX: (408) 535-5066
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED

JUL 6 2009

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRONIKARI BAKKE,

Defendant.

No. CR 09-00532 HRL

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE
SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

SAN JOSE VENUE

On July 2, 2009, United States Attorney Law Clerk Derek Ko and Assistant Federal Public Defender Manuel Araujo appeared for a status hearing in the above-referenced case. Mr. Araujo informed the Court that he was conducting an investigation into the case, and the parties requested that a further status hearing be scheduled for July 30, 2009 at 11:00 a.m. The government also requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from July 2, 2009 to July 30, 2009. The defendant, through Mr. Araujo, agreed to the exclusion. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based effective preparation of defense counsel.

1
2 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

3
4 DATED: 7/6/09

/s/
SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

5
6 DATED: 7/6/09

/s/
MANUEL ARAJUE
Assistant Federal Public Defender

7
8
9
10 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
11 under the Speedy Trial Act from July 2, 2009 to July 30, 2009. The Court finds, based on the
12 aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance
13 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant
14 the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective
15 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage
16 of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18
17 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv).

18 SO ORDERED.

19
20 DATED: 7/6/09


HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge